



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/963,719	09/26/2001	Susanne Marie Crockett	8285/255	9295
757	7590	02/13/2004	EXAMINER	
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P.O. BOX 10395 CHICAGO, IL 60611			NGUYEN, QUYNH H	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2642	6	
DATE MAILED: 02/13/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/963,719	CROCKETT ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Quynh H Nguyen	2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2001.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-67 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-67 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ .  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5 . 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brennan et al. (U.S. Patent 5,329,578).

Regarding claim 1, Brennan et al. teach detecting data for a call from a calling party to a called party (Fig. 2a, 101); and routing the call in accordance with information about the calling party (Fig. 2a, 103 and col. 4, line 67 through col. 5, line 4) and the called party (col. 4, lines 28-31 - complete the call according to the subscriber's profile).

Regarding claim 2, Brennan et al. teach providing a call routing message to the calling party customized for the calling party based at least in part on the information about the calling party (Fig. 2b, 202 and col. 11, lines 52-54).

Regarding claim 4, Brennan et al. teach the called party is a subscriber to the personal communication services (PCS) service and was provide with a subscriber special number (col. 13, lines 17-38); retrieving a subscriber profile for the subscriber; and providing a call routing message to the calling party customized for the calling party based on the information about the calling party and the subscriber profile (col. 4, lines 28-31 and Fig. 2a, 104).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3, 5-20, 44-46, 53-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brennan et al. (U.S. Patent 5,329,578) and in view of Chestnut (U.S. Patent 6,041,114).

Regarding claim 3, Brennan et al. do not teach providing a menu of call routing options to the calling party.

Chestnut teaches providing the caller with options of trying the called party at different locations (col. 3, lines 8-18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the feature of providing a menu of call routing options to the calling party, as taught by Chestnut, in Brennan's system in order to allow caller to have more control over the call routing.

Claims 5 and 11 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 3 and 4.

Claim 6 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 3. Furthermore, Brennan et al. teach determining calling line identification information for the calling party (col. 5, lines 2-4).

Regarding claims 7 and 8, Brennan et al. teach retrieving a stored subscriber profile associated with the called party (col. 4, lines 28-31) and special treatments are used to handle that callers identifiers based on a caller or a group of callers (col. 5, lines 2-59); the limitation on menu of call routing options is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 3.

Claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 2, 4 and 5. Furthermore, Brennan et al. teach the computer readable program code stored at the network element (Fig. 1b, col. 3, lines 54-55, and col. 4, lines 19-66).

Claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 5.

Regarding claims 12 and 13, Brennan et al. teach if the called party is a subscriber, routing the received call to designated network equipment for processing (col. 4, lines 25-35).

Regarding claims 14-16, Brennan et al. teach playing a standard or recorded announcement ("play the appropriate message 202" - col. 11, lines 50-54).

Regarding claims 17 and 46, Brennan et al. teach detecting dual tone multiple frequency input of the calling party (col. 10, lines 49-51).

Regarding claim 18, Brennan et al. teach detecting PIN data entered by the calling party; comparing the PIN with subscriber stored data of the subscriber profile and routing the call according to the subscriber profile (col. 11, lines 54-65). stored at the network element (Fig. 1b, col. 3, lines 54-55, and col. 4, lines 19-66).

Claim 19 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 9 and 10.

Regarding claim 20, Brennan et al. teach the network element comprises a service node (Fig. 1, 10).

Claim 44 and 45 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 10. Furthermore, Brennan et al. teach audible prompt played to subscriber's callers (col. 8, lines 34-35).

Claim 53 and 54 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 10, 44, and 45. Furthermore, Brennan et al. teach a personal number is the single PN of the subscriber subscribes for the personal communication service that identifies that particular subscriber, a subscriber-specific message for playback to the caller (col. 10, lines 34-48 and col. 11, lines 47-54).

Regarding claim 55, Brennan et al. do not teach detecting a toll free DN associated with the service subscriber. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the above feature in Brennan's system in order to allow the subscriber to access the PCS while traveling.

Regarding claims 56 and 57, Brennan et al. teach routing the call from the first telecommunication network comprises a landline telephone system to the second telecommunication network comprises a radiotelephone network (Fig. 1a).

Regarding claims 58 and 59, Brennan et al. teach detecting data for a call from a calling party to a called party (Fig. 2a, 101); and routing the call to a directory number (DN) associated with the subscriber (col. 4, lines 28-31 - complete the call according to

the subscriber's profile); if the call is not answered ("subscriber can't be reached"), offering the caller additional call routing options ("other devices such as: pager, messaging system, private operator, subscriber's secretary, external answering service, or other appropriate destination" - col. 6, lines 42-45 and col. 9, lines 58-65). Brennan et al. do not suggest upon selection of an additional call routing option by the caller, charging the caller a fee and routing the call in accordance with the selected options. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art some of these additional call routing options such as private operator, subscriber's secretary, external answering service would be charge a caller a fee.

Claim 60 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 45 and 58.

Regarding claim 61, Brennan et al. teach offering and selecting sequential contact option. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Brennan's system to offer simultaneous contact option in order to have a better system that has a variety of offering options.

Regarding claim 62, Brennan et al. teach call processing equipment (Figs. 1a-c); a platform storing a landline directory number, a voice mailbox identifier, a radiotelephone directory number (Fig. 1b); and the ringing time allowed (col. 1, lines 61-65). However, Brennan et al. do not teach a facsimile directory number; a preferred group of directory numbers for simultaneous and sequential ringing during menu-based call routing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify

Brennan's system to have the above-mentioned features in order to have a better system.

4. Claims 21-23, 29-39, 47-52, 63-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brennan et al. (U.S. Patent 5,329,578) and in view of Chestnut (U.S. Patent 6,041,114) and further in view of Wurster et al. (U.S. Patent 6,647,108).

Regarding claims 21-23, Brennan and Chestnut do not teach the network element comprises an intelligent peripheral, an originating and terminating Service Switching Point, and a Service Control Point.

Wurster et al. teach an intelligent telephone network (Fig. 1) comprises an intelligent peripheral (IP 23), an originating and terminating Service Switching Point (SSP (Central Office)), and a Service Control Point (SCP 19).

Claims 29, 37, 63, and 66 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 10 and 24.

Claims 30 and 31 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 16, 17, and 21.

Claims 32-36 and 65 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 25-28.

Regarding claim 38, Wurster et al. teach the SCP (ISCP 220) comprises data storage means for storing the subscriber routing information (col. 9, lines 60-62).

Regarding claim 39, Wurster et al. teach the SCP is further configured to communicate information about the call routing menu options to the SN/IP based on the subscriber routing information (col. 9, 31-33).

Claims 47-52 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 44. Furthermore, Wurster et al. teach his invention provides for multiple use of a telephone line to accommodate voice calls and lengthier data communication connectivity such as for accessing the Internet. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the mentioned above features with buttons on the display, in Brennan's system in order to have a better system.

Regarding claims 64 and 67, Brennan et al. do not teach an Internet access portal in data communication with the SCP database for remote access and updating of the subscriber profile by a subscriber. There are many references that teach the above feature, for example, Creamer et al. (U.S. patent 6,028,917) teach the system for provisioning extended telephone services such as: extended call forwarding, extended call waiting, extended caller ID, and extended fax transfer, on authorized base accounts by authorized users. Parameters relevant to a standard telephone service can be modified/updated to a telephone line associated with a given base account by an authorized end user via remote access, for example, use computers linked to AIN intelligent through the Internet or web in which an authorized user requests a service to modify his/her account (col. 2, lines 33-64).

5. Claims 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wurster et al. (U.S. Patent 6,647,108).

Regarding claim 24, Wurster et al. teach at an originating switch (Fig. 2, 210), receiving a call from a calling communication station (caller 260) for a DN;

communicating data about the call to a SCP 220 and retrieving subscriber routing information associated with the DN (col. 8, lines 59-67); routing the call to a terminating switch (SSP 212); the TAT prompt rerouting of the call to an intelligent peripheral (IP) for processing. However, Wurster et al. do not detail suggest initiating an interactive communication between an IP and the calling station and communicating information about call routing data received from the calling station from the IP to the SCP.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at that the steps of initiating an interactive communication between an IP and the calling station and communicating information about call routing data received from the calling station from the IP to the SCP are obvious in the signaling intelligent network and the advantage of using them are well known.

6. Claims 25-28, 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wurster et al. (U.S. Patent 6,647,108) in view of Brush et al. (U.S. Patent 6,674,851).

Regarding claims 25-28, Wurster et al. do not teach GR1129 protocol, encrypting and decrypting the message to extract the information about the call routing options.

Brush et al. teach GR1129 protocol (col. 4, lines 1-13). Brush et al. do not teach encrypting and decrypting the message to extract the information about the call routing options.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that protocol GR1129 is Bell Core defined protocol and well known in AIN environment; and incorporate the feature of encrypting and decrypting the message to extract the

information about the call routing options in Wurster's system in order to enhance the usage of GR1129 protocol.

Claims 40-43 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 25-28. Furthermore, Wurster et al. teach a memory and a processor (OSN 21, ISCP).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quynh H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

qhn

Quynh H. Nguyen  
February 5, 2004



AHMAD F. MATAR  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700